(6) The sponsor does not reside or maintain a place of business within the United States and the application has not been countersigned by an attorney, agent, or other representative of the applicant, which representative resides in the United States and has been duly authorized to act on behalf of the applicant and to receive communications on all matters pertaining to the application.

(7) The new animal drug is a drug subject to licensing under the animal virus, serum, and toxin law of March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. 832; 21 U.S.C. 151 *et seq.*). Such applications will be referred to the U.S. Department of Agriculture for action.

(8) It fails to include, with respect to each nonclinical laboratory study contained in the application, either a statement that the study was conducted in compliance with the good laboratory practice regulations set forth in part 58 of this chapter, or, if the study was not conducted in compliance with such regulations, a brief statement of the reasons for the noncompliance.

(9) [Reserved]

(10) The applicant fails to submit a complete environmental assessment which addresses each of the items specified in the applicable format under § 25.31 of this chapter or fails to provide sufficient information to establish that the requested action is subject to categorical exclusion under § 25.24 of this chapter

(c) If an application is determined not to be acceptable for filing, the applicant shall be notified within 30 days of receipt of the application and shall be given the reasons therefore.

(d) If the applicant disputes the findings that his application is not acceptable for filing, he may make written request that the application be filed over protest, in which case it will be filed as of the day originally received.

[40 FR 13825, Mar. 27, 1975, as amended at 50 FR 7517, Feb. 22, 1985; 50 FR 16668, Apr. 26, 1985]

§ 514.111 Refusal to approve an application.

(a) The Commissioner shall, within 180 days after the filing of the application, inform the applicant in writing of his intention to issue a notice of opportunity for a hearing on a proposal to refuse to approve the application, if the Commissioner determines upon the basis of the application, or upon the basis of other information before him with respect to a new animal drug, that:

(1) The reports of investigations required to be submitted pursuant to section 512(b) of the act do not include adequate tests by all methods reasonably applicable to show whether or not such drug is safe for use under the conditions prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the proposed labeling thereof; or

(2) The results of such tests show that such drug is unsafe for use under such conditions or do not show that such drug is safe for use under such conditions; or

(3) The methods used in and the facilities and controls used for the manufacture, processing, and packing of such drug are inadequate to preserve its identity, strength, quality, and purity; or

(4) Upon the basis of the information submitted to the Food and Drug Administration as part of the application, or upon the basis of any other information before it with respect to such drug, it has insufficient information to determine whether such drug is safe for use under such conditions. In making this determination the Commissioner shall consider, among other relevant factors:

(i) The probable consumption of such drug and of any substance formed in or on food because of the use of such drug;

(ii) The cumulative effect on man or animal of such drug, taking into account any chemically or pharmacologically related substances;

(iii) Safety factors which, in the opinion of experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the safety of such drugs, are appropriate for the use of animal experimentation data; and

(iv) Whether the conditions of use prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the proposed labeling are reasonably certain to be followed in practice; or

(5)(i) Evaluated on the basis of information submitted as part of the application and any other information before the Food and Drug Administration with respect to such drug, there is lack of substantial evidence consisting of adequate and well-controlled investigations, including clinical (field) investigation, by experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the effectiveness of the drug involved, on the basis of which it could fairly and reasonably be concluded by such experts that the drug will have the effect it purports or is represented to have under the conditions of use prescribed, recommended, or suggested in the proposed labeling.

(ii) The following principles have been developed over a period of years and are recognized by the scientific community as the essentials of adequate and well-controlled clinical (field) investigations. They provide the basis for the determination whether there is *substantial evidence* to support the claims of effectiveness for *new animal drugs.*

(*a*) The plan or protocol for the study and the report of the results of the effectiveness study must include the following:

(*1*) A clear statement of the objectives of the study.

(*2*) A method of selection of the subjects that—

(*i*) Provides adequate assurance that they are suitable for the purposes of the study, diagnostic criteria of the condition to be treated or diagnosed, confirmatory laboratory tests where appropriate, and, in the case of prophylactic agents, evidence of susceptibility and exposure to the condition against which prophylaxis is desired;

(*ii*) Assigns the subjects to test groups in such a way as to minimize bias; and

(*iii*) Assures comparability in test and control groups of pertinent variables, such as species, age, sex, duration and severity of disease, management practices, and use of drugs other than those being studied. When the effect of such variables is accounted for by an appropriate design, and when, within the same animal, effects due to the test drug can be obtained free of the effects of such variables, the same animal may be used for both the test drug and the control using the controls set forth in paragraph (a)(5)(ii)(*a*)(*4*)(*i*), (*ii*), or (*iii*) of this section.

(*3*) An explanation of the methods of observation and recording of the animal response variable studied and the means of excluding bias or minimizing bias in the observations.

(*4*) A comparison of the results of treatment or diagnosis with a control in such a fashion as to permit quantitative evaluation. The precise nature of the control must be stated and an explanation given of the methods used to minimize bias on the part of the observers and the analysts of the data. Level and methods of ''blinding,'' if used, are to be documented. Generally, four types of comparisons are recognized:

(*i*) No treatment: Where objective measurements of effectiveness are available and placebo effect is negligible, comparison of the objective results in comparable groups of treated and untreated animals.

(*ii*) Placebo control: Comparison of the results of use of the new animal drug entity with an inactive preparation designed to resemble the test drug as far as possible.

(*iii*) Active treatment control: An effective regimen of therapy may be used for comparison, e.g., where the condition treated is such that no treatment or administration of a placebo would be contrary to the well-being of the animals.

(*iv*) Historical control: In some circumstances involving diseases with high and predictable mortality (leukemia or tetanus) or with signs and symptoms of predictable duration or severity (some forms of parasitism, bovine hypocalcemia, canine eclampsia) or in the case of prophylaxis where morbidity is predictable, the results of use of a new animal drug entity may be compared quantitatively with prior experience historically derived from the adequately documented natural history of the disease or condition in comparable animals with no treatments or with a regimen (therapeutic, diagnostic, prophylactic) whose effectiveness is established.